

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30, and 51-58 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 were amended, and claims 31-50 were canceled. Consequently, claims 1-30, and 51-58 remain pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-30 and 51-58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Martin, U.S. Patent No. 6,363,419. The Examiner rejected claims 3, 11, 19, and 28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin further in view of Hancock et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,202,023. Applicant traverses the rejection and disagrees with the Examiner's statement that claims 9-10, 12-15, 20-23, 25-27, and 29-30 do not teach or define any new limitations over claims 1-2 and 4-7.

The present invention relates to a method and system for increasing ease-of-use and bandwidth utilization in a wireless device, and more particularly, to a method and system for providing an environment-sensitive user interface for such devices. The claims of the present invention are directed to two aspects of the invention. Independent claims 25 and 51 are directed to a method for generating and updating a URL database for providing an environmental sensitive user interface on a wireless device, while independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are directed to a method for using the URL database to increase ease-of-use and bandwidth utilization of the wireless device.

Claims 25 and 51

Martin fails to teach or suggest a method for generating and updating a URL database for providing an environmental sensitive user interface on a wireless device, as recited in claims 25 and 51. The generation of the URL database is accomplished by "collecting information indicating which URLs are accessed by the wireless devices in what environments and categorizing the URLs according to environment; analyzing the information collected for each

environment for patterns of use; and forming a location URL database from the patterns of use.” Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 were previously amended to comport with claims 25 and 51.

In contrast to the claims of the present invention, Martin is directed to a system for displaying idle content information on wireless computing devices during idle times. The idle content information displayed on the wireless computing device might display the network operator’s customer support telephone number or advertisements. In one embodiment, a browser program within the wireless computing device is used to display idle content information to the user during such time when the wireless computing device is idle.

Although Martin teaches that a proxy server linking the wireless network to the Internet may be used to provide location sensitive information that is then displayed on the mobile device when idle, Martin fails to teach or suggest a server that generates and updates “a URL database,” as recited in claims 25 and 51. Martin may teach that cellular handoff information can be utilized to generate specific idle content for the mobile device’s specific geographic location. However, generating specific idle content based on location does not teach or suggest “collecting information indicating which URLs are accessed by the wireless device in that geographic location,” nor does it teach or suggest “categorizing the URLs according to environment,” as recited in claims 25 and 51. Without a reporting of the URLs accessed by the device, Martin cannot teach or suggest “analyzing the information collected for each environment for patterns of use; and forming a location URL database from the patterns of use,” as recited in claims 25 and 51.

The Examiner admitted that “Martin fails to teach the limitation of maintaining a database of web site identifiers.” The Examiner then stated that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to modify Martin by specifying the servers 110 or 112 as the web site database since the same functionality of maintaining targeted content

is achieved.” Although web site databases may be well known, applicant respectfully request Examiner to produce a prior art reference disclosing a database of URLs that were accessed by a device in which the URL’s are categorized by environment and analyzed for patterns of use, as claimed. Absent such a teaching or suggestion, it is believed the rejection is based on improper hindsight. Accordingly, independent claims 25 and 51 are allowable over the references.

Claims 1, 9 and 7

As stated above, Martin may teach that cellular handoff information can be utilized to generate specific idle content for the mobile device’s specific geographic location. Martin fails, however, to teach or suggest “a database of web site identifiers that are categorized by environmental factors,” as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 17. Nothing in Martin teaches or suggests that the content sent to the mobile devices was “collected” and categorized according to environment,” as recited in claims 25 and 51.

Further, although Martin may teach receiving information about the wireless device’s environment, Martin fails to teach or suggest “querying the [URL] database using the environment information to determine web sites *most likely* to be requested by user of the wireless device in the environment,” as recited in claims 1, 9 and 17. Martin also fails to teach or suggest a system and method where “server policies determine which (of the identified) web site identifiers are sent to the device,” as claimed.

Hancock fails to correct the deficiencies of Martin. Hancock was cited for teaching an Internet based geographic location referencing system that provides local weather as the environment information. However, like Martin, Hancock also fails to teach or suggest a database of web site identifiers categorized by environmental factors that is used to determine web sites most likely to be requested by user in the environment.

Neither Martin or Hancock, alone or in combination, teach the cooperation of elements

claimed in the present invention.


Accordingly, for the above-identified reasons, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 51 is neither taught nor suggested by Martin and Hancock. Applicant further submits that dependent claims are also allowable because they depend on the above allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-30, and 51-58 are patentable over the cited reference. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen G. Sullivan", is written over a horizontal line.

Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540

August 6, 2004